

Appl. No. 09/715,717
Amdt. Dated November 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 25, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13910-US1
EUS/J/P04-3279

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner Objections – Drawings

The Office Action indicated that the Drawings filed on November 16, 2000 are accepted. The drawings filed on November 16, 2000 were informal drawings and the Applicant submitted formal drawings on May 30, 2001. The Applicant is re-filing the formal drawings under separate cover. For your convenience, a copy of that filing is attached.

Examiner Objections - Claims

Claim 16 was objected to because of informalities. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. However, claims 1-28 have been canceled rendering the objection moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Verma (US 6,522,880 hereinafter Verma). The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-28 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 14, 15, 17, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-28 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 2-3 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma. In order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicant has canceled claims 1-28 without prejudice. Therefore, this rejection with respect to these claims is deemed to be moot.

Appl. No. 09/715,717
Amdt. Dated November 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 25, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13910-US1
EUS/J/P/04-3279

Claims 4, 5, 11 and 14-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma in view of Singhal (US 6,633,761 hereinafter Singhal). The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-28 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma in view of Singhal in further view of Padovani (US 5,937,019 hereinafter Padovani). The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-28 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma in view of Cao (US 6,446,004 hereinafter Cao). The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-28 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma in view of Cao in further view of Padovani. The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-28 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 24 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma in view of Cao in further view of Singhal. The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-28 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

New claims 29-48 are currently pending and the Examiner's consideration of the new claims is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/715,717
Amdt. Dated November 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 25, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13910-US1
EUS/J/P/04-3279

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: November 23, 2004

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com